

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

MICHAEL L. HOLT,	Case No. 3:17-cv-00051-MMD-VPC
Plaintiff,	ORDER
v.	
99 CENT STORE OF RENO, NV, <i>et al.</i> ,	
Defendants.	


The Court adopted the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation and dismissed the second amended complaint with prejudice, without leave to amend. (ECF No. 9.) In response, Plaintiff filed an objection (ECF No. 11), a motion for hearing (ECF No. 12) and a motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 13.)

A motion to reconsider must set forth “some valid reason why the court should reconsider its prior decision” and set “forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to persuade the court to reverse its prior decision.” *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F.Supp.2d 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2003). Reconsideration is appropriate if this Court “(1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law.” *Sch. Dist. No. 1J v. Acands, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993).

Plaintiff asks for a hearing, but he offers no valid reason for the Court to reconsider its decision to dismiss his seconded amended complaint. Accordingly, the Court will deny reconsideration.

1 It is therefore ordered that Plaintiff's motion for hearing (ECF No. 12) and motion
2 for reconsideration (ECF No. 13) are denied. Plaintiff's objection (ECF No. 11) is construed
3 as a motion for reconsideration and is also denied.

4 DATED THIS 5th day of January 2018.

5 
6 _____
7 MIRANDA M. DU
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28